

NCKU-HEP-97-07

SOME ASPECTS OF THE BFKL EVOLUTION ¹

Hsiang-nan Li

Department of Physics, National Cheng-Kung University,
Tainan, Taiwan, Republic of China

abstract

I review the recent progress in small x physics, concentrating on the topics relevant to the BFKL evolution.

1 Introduction

It is known that radiative corrections in perturbative QCD (PQCD) produce large logarithms, such as $\alpha_s \ln Q$ in the kinematic region with large momentum transfer Q and $\alpha_s \ln(1/x)$ in the region with small Bjorken variable x . These large logarithms, spoiling the expansion in the coupling constant α_s , must be organized in some way. To sum the various logarithms contained in a parton distribution function to all orders, four well-known evolution equations have been proposed: The Dokshitzer-Gribov-Lipatov-Altarelli-Parisi (DGLAP) equation [1] sums $\ln Q$ for intermediate x , the Balitskii-Fadin-Kuraev-Lipatov (BFKL) equation [2] sums $\ln(1/x)$ for a small x , and the Ciafaloni-Catani-Fiorani-Marchesini (CCFM) equation [3], appropriate for both large and small x , unifies the above two equations. In the region with both large Q and small x many gluons are radiated in scattering processes with small spatial separation among them, and a new effect from the an-

¹talk presented at the International Symposium on QCD Corrections and New Physics, Hiroshima, Japan, 1997.

annihilation of two gluons into one gluon becomes important. The nonlinear Gribov-Levin-Ryskin (GLR) equation [4] takes into account this effect. All of the above equations can be applied to QCD processes at small x , though they give different evolutions in x of a parton distribution function. The DGLAP equation is applicable, since the relevant splitting functions show the desired x dependence. In this talk I will concentrate on the BFKL equation.

2 The BFKL Evolution

First, I list some important features of the BFKL evolution, which motivate the studies reported in the following sections.

2.1 The BFKL Equation

In the small x region gluon contributions dominate the structure functions involved in deep inelastic scattering (DIS) of a proton, such as $F_2(x, Q^2)$, Q being the momentum transfer from the virtual photon. Since the longitudinal component ξp^+ and the transverse component k_T of the gluon momentum may be of the same order, the transverse degrees of freedom of the gluon must be taken into account, leading to the k_T -factorization theorem [5],

$$F_2(x, Q^2) = \int_x^1 \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{k}_T}{\pi} H(x/\xi, Q, k_T) F(\xi, k_T) , \quad (1)$$

where H is the hard photon-gluon scattering subamplitude, and F the unintegrated gluon distribution function. If x is large, the k_T dependence in H is negligible. The integration of F over k_T then gives the gluon density G ,

$$\xi G(\xi, Q^2) = \int_0^Q \frac{d^2\mathbf{k}_T}{\pi} F(\xi, k_T) , \quad (2)$$

and Eq. (1) reduces to the conventional collinear factorization formula.

It is known that leading logarithmic corrections $\alpha_s \ln(1/x)$ are produced from a ladder diagram, where the rung gluons obey the strong rapidity ordering,

$$y_1 \gg y_2 \gg \dots \gg y_n , \quad (3)$$

with y_1 the rapidity of the rung gluon closest to the proton, and y_n the rapidity of the rung gluon closest to the hard scattering. One further reggeizes the

ladder gluons by assuming that their invariant masses are given by $k^2 = -k_T^2$. Summing the Reggeon ladders to all orders, one obtains the BFKL equation that describes the evolution of F at small x [2],

$$-x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x, k_T) = \bar{\alpha}_s k_T^2 \int \frac{d^2 \mathbf{k}'_T}{\pi k_T'^2} \left[\frac{f(x, k'_T) - f(x, k_T)}{|k_T'^2 - k_T^2|} + \frac{f(x, k_T)}{(4k_T'^4 - k_T^4)^{1/2}} \right], \quad (4)$$

with $f(x, k_T) = k_T^2 F(x, k_T)$ and $\bar{\alpha}_s = N_c \alpha_s / \pi$, $N_c = 3$ being the numebr of colors.

2.2 Solution to the BFKL Equation

Using the Mellin transform

$$\bar{f}(x, \omega) = \int_0^\infty (k^2)^{-\omega-1} f(x, k) dk^2, \quad (5)$$

$$f(x, k) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} (k^2)^\omega \bar{f}(x, \omega) d\omega, \quad (6)$$

Eq. (4) in the ω space is written, for fixed α_s , as

$$-x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \bar{f}(x, \omega) = K(\omega) \bar{f}(x, \omega), \quad (7)$$

where the trasformed BFKL kernel K is given by

$$K(\omega) = \bar{\alpha}_s [2\psi(1) - \psi(\omega) - \psi(1 - \omega)], \quad (8)$$

$$\psi(\omega) = \frac{d}{d\omega} \ln \Gamma(\omega), \quad \psi(1) = -\gamma_E, \quad (9)$$

γ_E being the Euler constant. $K(\omega)$ has a maximum at $\omega = 1/2$, around which it can be expanded as

$$K\left(\frac{1}{2} + i\nu\right) = \lambda - \frac{1}{2} \lambda'' \nu^2 + O(\nu^4), \quad (10)$$

with the constants $\lambda = \bar{\alpha}_s 4 \ln 2$ and $\lambda'' = \bar{\alpha}_s 28 \zeta(3)$, $\zeta(3) = 1.202$. Substituting Eq. (10) into (7), one solves for $\bar{f}$, and the inverse transform Eq. (6) gives

$$f(x, k) \approx \left(\frac{x}{x_0}\right)^{-\lambda} \frac{\bar{f}(x_0, 1/2) k}{[2\pi \lambda'' \ln(x_0/x)]^{1/2}} \exp \left[-\frac{(\ln k^2 - \ln \bar{k}^2)^2}{2\lambda'' \ln(x_0/x)} \right], \quad (11)$$

where

$$\ln \bar{k}^2 = i \frac{d}{d\nu} \left[\ln \bar{F} \left(x_0, \frac{1}{2} + i\nu \right) \right]_{\nu=0} \quad (12)$$

is the center of the Gaussian broadening in $\ln k^2$. x_0 is usually chosen as 0.1, below which the BFKL evolution begins.

Equation (11) exhibits the following features:

1. It possesses a power-law rise as $x^{-\lambda}$ with $\lambda \approx 0.5$ for reasonable values of $\bar{\alpha}_s$, which is attributed to hard pomeron exchanges (a pomeron can be regarded as a color-singlet Reggeon ladder). Recent HERA data [7] of the DIS structure function F_2 confirm this feature.

2. It does not depend on Q , implying that F_2 is insensitive to the variation of the momentum transfer. However, the rise of the data is characterized by λ with a stronger Q dependence: $\lambda \sim 0.2$ for $Q^2 \sim 4 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $\lambda \sim 0.5$ for $Q^2 \sim 50 \text{ GeV}^2$. At very low Q , $\lambda \sim 0.08$ corresponds to soft pomeron exchanges.

3. The transverse momentum k_T diffuses into a nonperturbative region at small x . Since the Gaussian width $\sqrt{2\lambda'' \ln(x_0/x)}$ increases with $1/x$, the distribution of the gluon in $\ln k^2$ centered at $\ln \bar{k}^2$ becomes broader. The nonperturbative region with small k^2 then gives essential contributions to F_2 , and PQCD is not reliable.

4. The power-law rise of f renders F_2 and the DIS cross section σ violate the unitarity bound $\sigma \leq \text{const.} \times \ln^2(1/x)$.

The above features have stimulated intensive studies of the BFKL evolution, whose progress will be reported below.

3 How to explain data?

To explain the data of the structure function F_2 , the DGLAP equation should be combined in some way, which introduces the Q dependence through the $\ln Q$ summation.

3.1 The DGLAP Equation

One may employ the DGLAP equation for the gluon density G directly [1],

$$Q^2 \frac{d}{dQ^2} G(x, Q^2) = \int_x^1 \frac{d\xi}{\xi} P_{gg}(x/\xi) G(\xi, Q^2) . \quad (13)$$

The required rise of G at small x is the result of the splitting function

$$P_{gg}(z) = \bar{\alpha}_s \left[\frac{1}{z} + \frac{1}{1-z} - 2 + z(1-z) \right] , \quad (14)$$

which diverges at $z \rightarrow 0$. It can be shown that G evolves according to

$$xG(x, Q^2) \propto \exp \left[2 \sqrt{\frac{N_c}{\beta_0} \ln \frac{1}{x} \ln \frac{t}{t_0}} \right] , \quad (15)$$

with the variable $t_{(0)} = \ln(Q_{(0)}^2/\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2)$ and β_0 the first coefficient of the QCD beta function.

For $Q_0^2 = 4 \text{ GeV}^2$, Eq. (15) gives $\lambda \sim 0.11$ for $Q^2 \sim 15 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $\lambda \sim 0.15$ for $Q^2 \sim 30 \text{ GeV}^2$. Obviously, these values of λ are too small to explain the rise of F_2 . Hence, a steeper input $G(x, Q_0^2)$ must be adopted to compensate the slower DGLAP evolution. If choosing $Q_0^2 = 0.3 \text{ GeV}^2$, $\lambda \sim 0.4$ for $Q^2 \sim 20 \text{ GeV}^2$ is large enough, and a flat input serves the purpose [8]. However, it has been criticized that the PQCD evolution around this low Q_0 is not reliable [6].

The k_T factorization shown in Eq. (1) is in fact equivalent to the collinear (mass) factorization [5], on which the DGLAP equation is based. Expressing the solution to Eq. (7) in the moment space, one obtains

$$\bar{f}_N(\omega) \propto \frac{f(x_0, \omega)}{N - K(\omega)} , \quad (16)$$

with the definition

$$\bar{f}_N(\omega) = \int_0^1 dx x^{N-1} \bar{f}(x, \omega) . \quad (17)$$

Equation (16) implies a pole of $\bar{f}_N(\omega)$ at $\omega = \gamma_N$, which satisfies $K(\gamma_N) = N$, and the parametrization of $F_N(k)$ from Eq. (6) [5],

$$F_N(k) = \frac{f_N(k)}{k^2} = \frac{\gamma_N}{\pi k^2} \left(\frac{k^2}{\mu^2} \right)^{\gamma_N} G_N(\mu^2) , \quad (18)$$

μ being an arbitrary factorization scale. γ_N is the BFKL anomalous dimension, whose perturbative expansion is given by

$$\gamma_N = \frac{\bar{\alpha}_s}{N} + 2\zeta(3) \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_s}{N} \right)^4 + O \left(\left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_s}{N} \right)^6 \right) . \quad (19)$$

Inserting the above expression into Eq. (1) in the moment space, one arrives at

$$F_{2,N}(Q^2) = C_N(Q^2/\mu^2)G_N(\mu^2) , \quad (20)$$

with the coefficient function

$$C_N(Q^2/\mu^2) = \gamma_N \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{k}}{\pi k^2} \left(\frac{k^2}{\mu^2} \right)^{\gamma_N} H_N(Q, k) . \quad (21)$$

It can be shown that $G_N(\mu^2)$ is related to the N -th moment of the gluon density G defined in the modified minimal subtraction scheme [9], and the BFKL anomalous dimension γ_N is the same as the gluon anomalous dimension $\gamma_{gg,N}$, the N -th moment of P_{gg} in Eq. (14), up to leading logarithms. Obviously, Eq. (20) is equivalent to the collinear factorization formula for F_2 .

3.2 Next-to-leading Logarithms

As a more complete analysis, one includes the singlet quark contribution through the DGLAP equation [10]

$$\frac{d}{d \ln \mu^2} \begin{pmatrix} Q \\ G \end{pmatrix} = \gamma \begin{pmatrix} Q \\ G \end{pmatrix} , \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{qq} & \gamma_{qg} \\ \gamma_{gq} & \gamma_{gg} \end{pmatrix} , \quad (22)$$

where Q denotes the singlet quark distribution function. The anomalous dimensions γ_{qq} and γ_{gg} , giving the next-to-leading-logarithm summation, leads to a steeper rise of G at small x compared to the DGLAP evolution in Eq. (15), which takes into account only the leading gluon contribution. The analysis concludes that a flat input $G(x, Q_0^2)$ at $Q_0^2 = 4 \text{ GeV}^2$ is preferred.

The above conclusion has been justified in an alternative way. One extracts the evolution equation for the gluon density G from Eq. (22) [11],

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi \partial \zeta} + \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} - \gamma^2 \right] G(\xi, \zeta) = 0 \quad (23)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= \ln \left(\frac{x_0}{x} \right) , \quad \zeta = \ln \left(\frac{t}{t_0} \right) , \\ \delta &= \frac{11 + 2n_f/27}{\beta_0} , \quad \gamma = \sqrt{\frac{12}{\beta_0}} , \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where the variable t has appeared in Eq. (15). With the further variable changes

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\xi\zeta}, \quad \rho = \sqrt{\frac{\xi}{\zeta}}, \quad (25)$$

Eq. (23) is easily solved to give

$$G(\sigma, \rho) \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi\gamma\sigma}} \exp\left(2\gamma\sigma - \delta\frac{\sigma}{\rho}\right). \quad (26)$$

Equation (26) exhibits two asymptotic scaling laws:

$$\ln G \propto \sigma \quad \text{for fixed } \rho, \quad (27)$$

$$\ln G \propto \text{const.} \quad \text{for fixed } \sigma. \quad (28)$$

The plots of the data of $\ln F_2$ with respect to σ and ρ indeed confirm the double scaling behavior at large σ and ρ . On the other hand, different inputs of $G(x, Q_0^2)$ lead to different slopes of the scaling. It was found that the predictions from the flat input match the data better. Because of the above more complete analyses, one is tempted to conclude that soft pomeron exchanges dominate in the low Q region. It was also argued that the BFKL pomeron appears only for [11]

$$\ln\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) > \left[\frac{\alpha_s(Q_0)}{\alpha_s(Q)}\right]^{20}. \quad (29)$$

3.3 The CCFM Equation

At last, one may resort to the CCFM equation, which embodies both the $\ln Q$ and $\ln(1/x)$ summations. It is written as [3]

$$F(x, p_T, Q) = F^{(0)}(x, p_T, Q) + \int_x^1 dz \int \frac{d^2 q}{\pi q^2} \theta(Q - zq) \Delta_S(Q, zq) \\ \times \tilde{P}(z, q, p_T) F(x/z, |\mathbf{p}_T + (1-z)\mathbf{q}|, q), \quad (30)$$

with the function

$$\tilde{P} = \bar{\alpha}_s(p_T) \left[\frac{1}{1-z} + \Delta_{NS}(z, q, p_T) \frac{1}{z} + z(1-z) \right] \quad (31)$$

similar to the gluon splitting function P_{gg} in Eq. (14). The so-called ‘‘Sudakov’’ exponential Δ_S and the ‘‘non-Sudakov’’ exponential Δ_{NS} are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_S(Q, zq) &= \exp \left[-\bar{\alpha}_s \int_{(zq)^2}^{Q^2} \frac{dp^2}{p^2} \int_0^{1-p_T/p} \frac{dz'}{1-z'} \right] \\ \Delta_{NS}(z, q, p_T) &= \exp \left[-\bar{\alpha}_s \int_z^{z_0} \frac{dz'}{z'} \int_{(z'q)^2}^{p_T^2} \frac{dp^2}{p^2} \right].\end{aligned}\quad (32)$$

where the upper bound z_0 of the variable z' takes the values [3, 12],

$$\begin{aligned}z_0 &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 1 \leq (p_T/q) \\ p_T/q & \text{if } z < (p_T/q) < 1 \\ z & \text{if } (p_T/q) \leq z. \end{cases}\end{aligned}\quad (33)$$

Δ_S collects the contributions from the ladder diagrams with rung gluons obeying the strong angular ordering, and is the result of the $\ln Q$ summation. Those gluons which do not obey the angular ordering are grouped into Δ_{NS} . In the small x region one adopts the approximate version of the CCFM equation [12],

$$\begin{aligned}F(x, p_T, Q) &= F^{(0)}(x, p_T, Q) + \bar{\alpha}_s(p_T) \int_x^1 \frac{dz}{z} \int \frac{d^2q}{\pi q^2} \theta(Q - zq) \theta(q - \mu) \\ &\quad \times \Delta_{NS}(z, q, p_T) F(x/z, |\mathbf{p}_T + (1-z)\mathbf{q}|, q).\end{aligned}\quad (34)$$

where the extra function $\theta(q - \mu)$ introduces an infrared cutoff of the variable q , and $F^{(0)}$ is a flat nonperturbative driving term.

The CCFM evolution with x has been extracted from Eq. (34) [13], given by

$$F \propto \exp[2\bar{\alpha}_s \ln(Q/\mu) \ln(1/x)].\quad (35)$$

It shows a steeper rise at small x than the DGLAP evolution in Eq. (15), though it also considers only the leading gluon contribution, and a more Q -dependent rise than the BFKL evolution in Eq. (11). This is the reason the CCFM equation can explain the data well [12]. The steeper CCFM rise compared to the DGLAP rise is attributed to the different choices of the argument of the running coupling constant in the splitting function, which is

p_T in the former (see Eq. (31)) and Q in the latter. Therefore, $\alpha_s(p_T)$ does not run in fact, as the variable q is integrated over in the CCFM equation (34). While $\alpha_s(Q)$ runs, when solving the DGLAP equation. Because of $\alpha_s(p_T) > \alpha_s(Q)$, the CCFM evolution is stronger.

4 Where is the hard pomeron?

In the previous section it has been stated that soft pomeron contributions dominate in the low- Q region, and the high- Q behavior of the DIS structure function is the consequence of the DGLAP evolution plus a nonperturbative input. Though the BFKL equation gives an equally good explanation of the data at large Q , it is still worthwhile to ask where the clear evidence for the BFKL (hard) pomeron is. To answer this question, many processes have been proposed.

4.1 Two-jet Processes

Consider the two-jet production from hadron-hadron collisions [14],

$$p + p \rightarrow 2 \text{ jets} + X . \quad (36)$$

If tagging the jet with longitudinal momentum fraction x_i , transverse momentum p_{iT} and rapidity y_i , $i = 1, 2$, the momentum fractions of the initial-state partons will be fixed at x_i due to the kinematic relation

$$x_i = (p_{iT}/\sqrt{s}) \exp(y_i) , \quad (37)$$

s being the center-of-mass energy, when the rapidity gap $\Delta y = y_1 - y_2$ is large. It was argued that many minijets are radiated from the t -channel exchanged gluon between the initial-state partons at large Δy , such that the cross section $d^2\sigma/(dy_1 dy_2)$ increases with Δy . This rise is definitely attributed to the BFKL pomeron contribution, since the nonperturbative parton distribution functions take the values at $x = x_i$ (no evolution in x) after the jet tagging. However, an explicit evaluation of $d^2\sigma/(dy_1 dy_2)$ showed that it, contrary to the expectation, decreases with Δy in the available range of s [15]. The reason is that x_i approaches unity for finite p_{iT} and s as Δy increases, and thus the parton distribution functions vanish.

An alternative was then suggested, where the angle decorrelation between the two tagged jets is measured [15]. The radiation of the minijets washes out the correlation of the two jets with angle $\phi = \pi$ at a rate that increases with Δy . The explicit analyses of the ϕ decorrelation have confirmed this expectation [15].

4.2 One Jet in DIS

A similar process with one forward jet in DIS was proposed [16]. By tagging the jet with momentum fraction x_j and transverse momentum k_{jT} , the momentum fraction of the initial-state parton is fixed at x_j . k_{jT} is chosen as being large enough to avoid the k_T diffusion into the nonperturbative region. The t -channel exchanged gluon radiated from the parton emits many minijets, such that the structure function F_2 behaves as

$$\frac{\partial F_2(x)}{\partial \ln(1/x_j) \partial k_{jT}} \propto \alpha_s(k_{jT}) x_j f(x_j) \left(\frac{x}{x_j} \right)^{-\lambda}. \quad (38)$$

Note that the parton distribution function

$$f = G + \frac{4}{9}(Q + \bar{Q}) \quad (39)$$

is evaluated at $x = x_j$, and the nonperturbative ambiguity is removed. The rise $x^{-\lambda}$ is then clearly identified as the consequence of the BFKL evolution. Though it is challenging to tag a forward jet, experimental studies have been attempted with encouraging results [17].

Instead of tagging a forward jet, it has been suggested to tag a forward photon [18]. The advantage of this process is that it is cleaner. However, it is suppressed by the coupling constant α_{EM} compared to the previous process, and the photon needs to be isolated from π^0 .

4.3 Levin's Viewpoint

Though all the above analyses and experiments have not yet fully confirmed the existence of the BFKL pomeron, Levin argued that its evidence had been contained in the current data [19]. To demonstrate his viewpoint, an average

of the BFKL anomalous dimension $\langle\gamma\rangle$ and the strength of the shadowing corrections κ are defined by

$$\langle\gamma\rangle = \frac{\sum_N \gamma_N G_N(Q^2)}{\sum_N G_N(Q^2)}, \quad \kappa = \frac{3\pi\alpha_s}{Q^2 R^2} G(x, Q^2). \quad (40)$$

The BFKL anomalous dimension γ_N and the moment of the gluon density G_N that obeys the DGLAP evolution have been introduced in Sect. 3.1. $\langle\gamma\rangle$ can be regarded as measuring the BFKL content in the DGLAP gluon density employed in the explanation of the DIS data [20]. If $\langle\gamma\rangle$ is located between 1/2 and 1, it is claimed that the gluon density contains significant BFKL pomeron contribution. From the GLR equation (see Eq. (41) below), it is easy to observe that κ corresponds to the nonlinear term, describing the effect of two gluon annihilation into one gluon. R is the correlation length of the radiated gluons. For $\kappa > 1$, the shadowing correction is considered to be large.

A simple analysis showed that the BFKL region between $\langle\gamma\rangle = 1/2$ and $\langle\gamma\rangle = 1$ in the $\ln(1/x)$ - $\ln Q^2$ plane indeed penetrates the region which has been explored by the HERA experiments. However, the BFKL region is completely located in the region with $\kappa > 1$. Hence, Levin concluded that the BFKL pomeron contribution has been contained in the current HERA data, but is suppressed by the shadowing correction, and thus unobservable.

5 How to Recover Unitarity?

As stated in Sect. 2, the power-law rise $x^{-\lambda}$ violates the unitarity bound, implying that the BFKL equation derived from the leading-twist and leading-logarithm approximation needs to be corrected. The attempts to include higher-twist and next-to-leading logarithmic contributions have been made.

5.1 The GLR Equation

In the region with both large Q and small x , many gluons are radiated by partons with small spatial separation among them. A new effect from the annihilation of two gluons into one gluon is then essential. Taking into account this effect, the BFKL equation is modified by a nonlinear term,

leading to the GLR equation [4],

$$\frac{\partial^2 xG(x, Q^2)}{\partial \ln(1/x) \partial \ln Q^2} = \bar{\alpha}_s xG(x, Q^2) - \frac{\gamma \alpha_s}{Q^2 R^2} [xG(x, Q^2)]^2, \quad (41)$$

The constant $\gamma = 81/16$ is regarded as the effective coupling of the annihilation process, and the radius R characterizes the correlation length of the radiative gluons as mentioned before. It is obvious that the second term is of higher twist, but becomes important as R is small. The minus sign in front of it implies that the annihilation decreases the number of gluons, and that the rise of the gluon density at small x due to the first term might saturate.

This equation is, however, nonlinear, and the values of R depend on models. It is set to 2 GeV^{-1} for the model with the radiative gluons concentrated at hot spots, and 5 GeV^{-1} for the model with the gluons uniformly distributed in a hadron.

5.2 Next-to-leading Logarithms

To recover the unitarity in the framework of the BFKL equation, it was proposed to compute the kernel that includes next-to-leading $\ln(1/x)$, which arise from relaxing the strong rapidity ordering of rung gluons. That is, the contribution from the region with, for example,

$$y_1 \sim y_2 \gg y_3 \gg \dots \gg y_n, \quad (42)$$

should be computed. The virtual and real corrections have been obtained in [21] and in [22], respectively. However, an explicit expression of the BFKL kernel including next-to-leading logarithms has not been extracted from the above analyses (the phase-space integrals for the amplitudes of real gluon emissions given in [22] were not performed). Hence, no concrete conclusion on the unitarity has been drawn. Since the involved calculations are very tedious, I will not go into the details. Readers are referred to Ref. [23] for summary of the progress on this subject.

5.3 Multiple Pomeron Exchanges

Multiple pomeron exchanges, as higher-twist contributions, have been studied by means of colored-dipole scatterings [24]. Consider an onium, which is

the $Q\bar{Q}$ bound state with Q a heavy quark. The gluon emission inside the onium, from the viewpoint of color flow, can be regarded as being composed of the $Q\text{-}\bar{Q}$ pair in the color octet state. Many gluons then imply many quark pairs. The emitted quarks and valence quarks, combined among each other, form many colored-dipoles in the onium. In this picture, the onium-onium forward scattering is then formulated as multiple dipole scatterings. One of the advantages of this process is that the onium size provides a natural infrared cutoff, and thus resolves the problem of the k_T diffusion.

To compute the cross section, one defines a dipole density $n(x, Y)$ for an onium, with x the transverse size of a dipole and Y the rapidity. At high energy, it has been shown that n increases with Y due to the same mechanism as of the rise of the gluon distribution function with $1/x$. That is, the equation that governs the evolution of n with Y is equivalent to the equation that governs the evolution of F with $\ln(1/x)$ [25]. However, the derivation of the kernel for the former is much simpler than that for the latter. Though the whole evolution kernels for n and for F are equal, the parts from real gluon emissions and from virtual gluon emissions differ. To obtain the kernel for F , all the higher-order diagrams are considered. For the kernel of n , only the diagrams with radiative gluons emitted before the hard onium-onium scattering are considered, since they are the diagrams that modify the dipole density for an initial-state onium. With this criterion, the number of diagrams needed to be computed is greatly reduced. This is another advantage of the above process.

Since the formalism for dipole scatterings is simpler, it can be extended to include multiple pomeron exchanges. Recall that the t -channel gluon responsible for the hard scattering is reggeized at large rapidity gap, and two reggeons form a pomeron. The cross sections including single and double pomeron exchanges have been obtained, which exhibit a rise with Y [25]. As to the unitarity, for which infinite many pomeron exchanges may be essential, no conclusive progress has been made following this vein.

5.4 Reggeon Compound States

The higher-twist contributions from multiple pomeron (reggeon) exchanges can be taken into account in another interesting approach [26]. As explained in Sect. 2, a reggeized gluon is a two-dimensional object, since its propagator depends only on the transverse momentum. Hence, in high-energy

scatterings (3+1) QCD is reduced to (2+1) Regge theory [27]. Consider the compound state of N reggeons distributed randomly in a x - y plane. It has been shown that only the nearest-neighbor interaction survives in the large N_c limit. Under this approximation, these reggeons can be arrayed into a one-dimensional space in the sequence where the interaction occurs between any two neighboring reggeons. Certainly, there exist two such one-dimensional spaces, characterized by $z = x + iy$ and $\bar{z} = x - iy$. Then the (2+1) Regge theory is further reduced to a $(1 + 1) \otimes (1 + 1)$ Schrodinger equation. It is trivial to observe that each of the one-dimensional systems is an exactly solvable Heisenberg model with spin $s = 0$.

The Hamiltonian and the corresponding Schrodinger equation are written as

$$H_N(z, \bar{z}) = \bar{\alpha}_s [H_N(z) + H_N(\bar{z})] , \quad (43)$$

$$H_N \chi_N = E_N \chi_N , \quad (44)$$

where χ_N is the wave function of the N -reggeon compound state with the eigenenergy E_N . The eigenenergy can be identified as the intercept of the Regge trajectory. Therefore, by computing the eigenenergy of the compound state, one understands how the power-law rise of the structure function F_2 varies with the reggeon number N :

$$F_2^{(N)}(x, Q^2) \sim x^{-E_N} . \quad (45)$$

$E_2 = \bar{\alpha}_s 4 \ln 2$ for the $N = 2$ case, which corresponds to the BFKL pomeron exchange, was found. The tendency $E_2 > E_3 > \dots$ has been observed, indicating that the rise is indeed softened gradually as N increases, though it is still power-like. Since the $N \rightarrow \infty$ case remains unsolved, a concrete conclusion on the unitarity is still not available.

6 Summary

In this talk I reviewed the recent progress in small x physics. Obviously, many issues need to be studied theoretically and experimentally with more effort.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the National Science Council of Republic of China under the Grant No. NSC87-2112-M-006-018.

References

References

- [1] V.N. Gribov and L.N. Lipatov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **15**, 428 (1972); G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, *Nucl. Phys. B* **126**, 298 (1977); Yu.L. Dokshitzer, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **46**, 641 (1977).
- [2] E.A. Kuraev, L.N. Lipatov and V.S. Fadin, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **45**, 199 (1977); Ya.Ya. Balitskii and L.N. Lipatov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **28**, 822 (1978); L.N. Lipatov, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **63**, 904 (1986).
- [3] M. Ciafaloni, *Nucl. Phys. B* **296**, 49 (1988); S. Catani, F. Fiorani, and G. Marchesini, *Phys. Lett. B* **234**, 339 (1990); *Nucl. Phys. B* **336**, 18 (1990); G. Marchesini, *Nucl. Phys. B* **445**, 49 (1995).
- [4] L.V. Gribov, E.M. Levin and M.G. Ryskin, *Nucl. Phys. B* **188**, 555 (1981); *Phys. Rep.* **100**, 1 (1983).
- [5] T. Jaroszewicz, *Acta. Phys. Pol. B* **11**, 965 (1980); S. Catani, M. Ciafaloni, and F. Hautmann, *Phys. Lett. B* **242**, 97 (1990); *Nucl. Phys. B* **366**, 657 (1991); *Phys. Lett. B* **307**, 147 (1993); S. Catani and F. Hautmann, *Nucl. Phys. B* **427**, 475 (1994).
- [6] A.J. Askew, J. Kwieciński, A.D. Martin, and P.J. Sutton, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 4402 (1994)
- [7] ZEUS Collaboration, M. Derrick *et al.*, *Z. Phys. C* **65**, 379 (1995); H1 Collaboration, T. Ahmed *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **439**, 471 (1995).
- [8] M. Glück, E. Reya, and A. Vogt, *Z. Phys. C* **53**, 127 (1992); *Phys. Lett. B* **306**, 391 (1993).

- [9] S. Catani and F. Hautmann, *Phys. Lett. B* **315**, 157 (1993); *Z. Phys. C* **70**, 263 (1996).
- [10] R.K. Ellis, F. Hautmann, and B.R. Webber, *Phys. Lett. B* **348**, 582 (1995).
- [11] R.D. Ball and S. Forte, *Phys. Lett. B* **335**, 77 (1994); *Phys. Lett. B* **336**, 77 (1994).
- [12] J. Kwieciński, A.D. Martin, and P.J. Sutton, *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 1445 (1995); *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 6094 (1996).
- [13] J.L. Lim and H-n. Li, Report No. hep-ph/9712408.
- [14] A.H. Mueller and H. Navelet, *Nucl. Phys. B* **282**, 727 (1987).
- [15] V. Del Duca and C.R. Schmidt, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 4510 (1994); W.J. Stirling *Nucl. Phys. B* **423**, 56 (1994).
- [16] A.H. Mueller, in *Proceeding of the Topical Workshop on the Small- x Behavior of Deep Inelastic Scattering Structure Functions in QCD*, Hamburg, Germany, 1990, edited by A. Ali and J. Bartels [*Nucl. Phys. B* (Proc. Suppl.) **18C**, 125 (1990)];
- [17] H1 Collaboration, S. Aid *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **356**, 118 (1995).
- [18] J. Kwieciński, S.C. Lang, and A.D. Martin, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 1874 (1996).
- [19] E. Levin, talk presented at the Riken/BNL workshop on PQCD as a probe of the hadronic structure, BNL, New York, 1997.
- [20] J.R. Forshaw, R.G. Roberts, and R.S. Thorne, *Phys. Lett. B* **356**, 79 (1995).
- [21] V.S. Fadin and L.N. Lipatov, *Nucl. Phys. B* **406**, 259 (1993); V. Fadin, R. Fiore, and A. Quartarolo, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 2265 (1994); *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 5893 (1994).
- [22] V. Del Duca, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 989 (1996); *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 4474 (1996).

- [23] G. Camici and M. Ciafaloni, *Nucl. Phys. B* **496**, 305 (1997).
- [24] A.H. Mueller and B. Patel, *Nucl. Phys. B* **415**, 373 (1994); *Nucl. Phys. B* **425**, 471 (1994).
- [25] Z. Chen and A.H. Mueller, *Nucl. Phys. B* **451**, 579 (1995).
- [26] G.P. Korchemsky, Report No. hep-ph/9501232.
- [27] L.N. Lipatov, *Nucl. Phys. B* **452**, 369 (1995).